

DETAILED ACTION

1. This final office action is in response to the amendment filed 13 February 2008.
2. Claims 1-22 are pending. Claim 1 is an independent claim.

Information Disclosure Statement

3. The information disclosure statement (IDS) submitted on 13 February 2008 is in compliance with the provisions of 37 CFR 1.97. Accordingly, the information disclosure statement is being considered by the examiner.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

4. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

5. Claims 1-3, 5-6, 8, 10-13, and 22 remain rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Van Den Berghe et al. (WO 00/31657, published 2 June 2000, hereafter Van Den Berghe).

As per independent claim 1, Van Den Berghe discloses a method for producing Internet information, comprising:

Storing by an end user unit a downloaded web page with an associated address as a web object (page 12, lines 6- page 14, line 36: Here, the Data Propagation Server

is an end unit user, as the DPS stores the downloaded data, however, the data from the DPS is not sent to another end user)

Processing the associated address of the web page to generate address information of the downloaded web page as one or more attributes (page 12, lines 6- page 14, line 36)

Storing address information as an associated web object (page 12, lines 6- page 14, line 36: Here, the proxy server generates pages by pulling merchant information into a web page (object). The Data Propagation Server (DPS) stores the associated web objects, including the web address. The parsed data is then sent to a user for display within the Lead Web Site via the PPS (page 13, lines 30-41))

As per dependent claim 2, Van Den Berghe discloses wherein the downloaded web page in the end user unit produces further attributes and stores the further attributes in the web object (page 12, lines 6-15: Here, the APS feeds the proxy server user attributes, which are rerouted to each of the appropriate merchant sites).

As per dependent claim 3, Van Den Berghe discloses wherein, in addition to the attributes, the associated web pages or selected parts thereof are stored in the web object (page 12, lines 6-38).

As per dependent claim 5, Van Den Berghe discloses wherein a list of web pages previously visited in a same domain is entered as a further attribute for the web page (page 12, lines 6-15: Here, the shopping cart records a history of merchant sites visited from which a user has purchased items).

As per dependent claim 6, Van Den Berghe discloses wherein an end user inputs into "input" fields on the web page are entered as further attributes for the web page (page 12, lines 6-38; page 13, lines 20-25: Here, a user profile (data) is inputted and entered at merchant sites when a user purchases items).

As per dependent claim 8, Van Den Berghe discloses wherein the segments from the addresses are chosen such that reliable means of access to the web pages are obtained (page 12, lines 19-38).

As per dependent claim 10, Van Den Berghe discloses wherein the one or more attributes are transmitted to one or more further Internet end users (page 13, lines 16-25; page 11, lines 6-38).

As per dependent claim 11, Van Den Berghe discloses wherein in addition to the attributes, the associated downloaded web page or the selected parts thereof are transmitted (page 12, lines 6-38: Here, portions of a merchant site, such as an item description, are added to the web page and pushed to the user).

As per dependent claim 12, Van Den Berghe discloses wherein the attributes are automatically generated from addresses by using respective address to search a configuration file and, if a segment of the address is found in the configuration file, by assigning this part as a sought attribute from the address of the web page (page 11, lines 6-38: Here, the merchant sites are searched for the item description. If the item description is found, it is added to the web page, and pushed to the user for display).

As per dependent claim 13, Van Den Berghe discloses wherein the configuration file contains attribute templates, comprising text patterns and appropriate attribute names (page 11, lines 6-38).

As per dependent claim 22, Van Den Berghe discloses wherein transmission is effected via a web server using HTTP (page 11, lines 6-38).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

6. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

7. Claims 15 and 17-21 remain rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Van Den Berghe.

As per dependent claim 15, Van Den Berghe discloses the limitations similar to those in claim 1. Van Den Berghe discloses combining a plurality of web objects to form a web page (page 11, lines 6-38). Van Den Berghe fails to disclose the creation of a web packet. However, it was notoriously well known in the art at the time of the applicant's invention that a web packet is a formatted grouping of data transmitted via a network. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the

applicant's invention to have combined web packets with Van Den Berghe, thereby allowing for the web objects to be sent over a network.

As per dependent claim 16, Van Den Berghe discloses the limitations similar to those in claim 15, and the same rejection is incorporated herein. Van Den Berghe fails to specifically disclose wherein the web packet is combined with the associated additional attributes to form a packet file. However, Van Den Berghe discloses storing additional attributes in the web object (page 12, lines 6-38). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to have combined the web object containing the additional attributes into web packets, thereby creating a packet file. This would have been beneficial since it would have allowed a user to incorporate all relevant information into a single file for transmission to a user.

As per dependent claim 17, Van Den Berghe discloses the limitations similar to those in claim 15, and the same rejection is incorporated herein. Van Den Berghe fails to specifically disclose wherein the web packet is combined with the associated additional attributes to form a packet file. However, Van Den Berghe discloses storing additional attributes in the web object (page 12, lines 6-38). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to have combined the web object containing the additional attributes into web packets, thereby creating a packet file. This would have been beneficial since it would have allowed a user to incorporate all relevant information into a single file for transmission to a user.

As per dependent claim 18, Van Den Berghe discloses the limitations similar to those in claim 17, and the same rejection is incorporated herein. Van Den Berghe

discloses transmitting web pages to a user in whole or parts to end users (page 11, lines 6-38). Van Den Berghe fails to specifically disclose transmitting a packet file. However, It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to have combined the web object containing the additional attributes into web packets, thereby creating a packet file. This would have been beneficial since it would have allowed a user to incorporate all relevant information into a single file for transmission to a user.

As per dependent claim 19, Van Den Berghe discloses the limitations similar to those in claim 1, and the same rejection is incorporated herein. Van Den Berghe fails to specifically disclose processing and displaying attributes to an end user. However, it was notoriously well known in the art at the time of the applicant's invention that data may be processed (parsed) and displayed to a user via a web browser. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to have combined a user's web browser for displaying data with Van Den Berghe, thereby allowing a user to view the pages generated and pushed by the server.

As per dependent claim 20, Van Den Berghe discloses the limitations similar to those in claim 19, and the same rejection is incorporated herein. Van Den Berghe fails to specifically disclose use of a plug-in. However, it was notoriously well known in the art at the time of the applicant's invention that a plug-in may be used in order to extend the normal operation of a web browser. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to have combined a plug-in with

Van Den Berghe, since it would have allowed a user to extend the processing of a browser to include displaying the generated pages.

As per dependent claim 21, Van Den Berghe discloses the limitations similar to those in claim 20, and the same rejection is incorporated herein. Van Den Berghe discloses transmitting data (page 11, lines 6-38). However, Van Den Berghe fails to disclose the transmission medium being e-mail. However, it was notoriously well known in the art at the time of the applicant's invention that data may be transmitted via e-mail, thereby allowing for data to be sent to only specified users. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to have combined e-mail with Van Den Berghe, since it would have allowed a user to specify recipients of the data.

8. Claim 4 remains rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Van Den Berghe and further in view of Tremblay et al. (US 2003/0172316, filed 6 March 2002, hereafter Tremblay).

As per dependent claim 4, Van Den Berghe discloses the limitations similar to those in claim 2, and the same rejection is incorporated herein. Van Den Berghe fails to specifically disclose wherein the date and time when the web page is downloaded are entered. Tremblay discloses storing the date and time when the web page is downloaded (paragraph 0040). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to have combined Tremblay with Van Den Berghe, since it would have allowed a user to easily determine the age of the web page.

9. Claim 7 remains rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Van Den Berghe and further in view of Koskas (US 2002/0095421, filed 13 December 2000).

As per dependent claim 7, Van Den Bergh discloses the limitations similar to those in claim 2, and the same rejection is incorporated herein. Van Den Bergh fails to specifically disclose wherein segments from addresses for links in the web page are entered as further attributes. However, Koskas discloses wherein segments from addresses for links in the web page are entered as further attributes (paragraph 0132). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to have combined Koskas with Van Den Berghe, since it would have allowed a user to maintain a list of links contained with the web page.

10. Claim 9 remains rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Van Den Berghe and further in view of Oberwager et al. (US 6510430, filed 24 February 1999, hereafter Oberwager).

As per dependent claim 9, Van Den Berghe discloses the limitations similar to those in claim 2, and the same rejection is incorporated herein. Van Den Berghe fails to specifically disclose obtaining remarks text. However, Oberwager discloses obtaining remarks text (column 9, lines 54-65). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to have combined Oberwager with Van

Den Berghe, since it would have allowed a user to store reviews of items displayed within the webpage.

11. Claim 14 remains rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Van Den Berghe and further in view of Murren et al. (US 2004/0205525, filed 30 April 2001, hereafter Murren).

As per dependent claim 14, Van Den Berghe discloses the limitations similar to those in claim 13, and the same rejection is incorporated herein. Van Den Berghe fails to specifically disclose wherein the segments are stored as named attributes. However, Murren discloses storing the attributes as name-value pairs (paragraphs 0122-0127). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to have combined Murren with Van Den Berghe, since it would have allowed a user to associate both the attributes and their values together.

Response to Arguments

12. Applicant's arguments filed 13 February 2008 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

The applicant's arguments are based upon the belief that Van Den Berghe fails to specifically disclose storing by an end user unit a downloaded web page with an associated address as a web object; processing the associated address of the web page to generate address information of the downloaded web page as one or more attributes; and storing address information as an associated web object (pages 1-3).

However, the examiner respectfully disagrees. Van Den Berghe discloses storing by an end user unit a downloaded web page with an associated address as a web object (page 12, lines 6- page 14, line 36) A Data Propagation Server (DPS) is disclosed. The DPS qualifies as an end unit user, due to the fact that the DPS stores the downloaded data without the data from the DPS is not sent to another end user. Further, Van Den Bergh discloses processing the associated address of the web page to generate address information of the downloaded web page as one or more attributes (page 12, lines 6- page 14, line 36). Finally, Van Den Berghe discloses storing the address information as an associated web object (page 12, lines 6- page 14, line 36) The proxy server generates pages by pulling merchant information into a web page (object). The DPS then stores the associated web objects, including the web address. Finally, the parsed data is then sent to a user for display within the Lead Web Site via the PPS (page 13, lines 30-41).

Conclusion

13. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of

Art Unit: 2178

the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to KYLE R. STORK whose telephone number is (571)272-4130. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday (8:00-4:30).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Stephen Hong can be reached on (571) 272-4124. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Kyle R Stork
Examiner
Art Unit 2178

/Stephen S. Hong/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art
Unit 2178

krs